

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment. The Examiner states, at page 2 of the Office Action that claims 29-88 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated 10-20-2004, the Examiner indicated claims 29-90 were pending. Claims 89 and 90 depend from claim 88. Thus claims 88 and 90 should be pending. In a telephone discussion with the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that claims 89 and 90 are pending and if there is another Office Action in response to this paper, it will not be final.

In response to the Examiner's comments in paragraph 1 at page 2. Attached herewith is a Certificate of Correction for US 5,635,846, which refers to it as a CIP of US 5,371,654. The present application claims priority to US 5,635,846 and US 5,379,654.

Claims 45-48, 50, 52, 59, 95-102, 107, 124-139 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In regard to claim 45, the Examiner queries what "electrical connections" are comprised of. Applicants' Fig. 2 show electrical connections 64 and Fig. 3 show electrical connections 85. These are examples only and are not limiting. A person of skill in the art in view of Applicants teaching can make other embodiments of "electrical connections". Claims 46 to 48 and 59 depend directly from claim 45.

In regard to claim 45 the Examiner further states "it is also unclear how 'a plurality of probe elements' are interrelated and associated with electrical connections." Applicants Figs. 2 and 3 are non-limiting examples. Probes 46 are interrelated to electrical conductors 64 and 85 through element 54. Thus claim 45 is definite.

In regard to claim 45 the Examiner further states “on line 11, it is unclear what ‘a surface’ is referred to.” A non-limiting example is shown in Figs. 2 and 3, wherein the ends of probe tips 46 are pressed against surface of element 50. Thus claim 45 is definite.

In regard to claim 50 the Examiner states, it is “unclear how “[SIC] a plurality of said plurality if the flexible electrical contact elements (264, 260) are interrelated and associated with the flexible contact element making contact with the electronic device, printed circuit board,” Figs. 2, 3, 17, 18 and 20 show non-limiting examples. In Fig. 2 and 3 show a group of flexible electrical conductors 46. More than one such group can be coupled to element 54 such as shown in Fig. 17, 18 and 20, in particular a plurality of groups of flexible electrical contact elements 246. Thus claim 50 is definite.

In regard to claim 52 the Examiner states, “it is unclear how “[SIC] a plurality of said second substrates (236) are interrelated and associated with the second substrate as recited in claims 29, 33-34, 36-37 and 42-43.” By way of non-limiting example Fig. 3 shows substrate 54 mounted to substrate 68. More than one substrate 54 can be mounted to substrate 68 just as in Fig. 17 more than one substrate 236 is mounted to substrate 28 or more than one substrate 249 is mounted to substrate 28. Thus claim 52 is definite.

In regard to claim 95 and 132 the Examiner states, “it is unclear what ‘a projection’ comprises of.” Fig. 39 shows a projection 2128 on a planar surface 2232. This is a non-limiting example. Thus claims 95 and 132 are definite.

In regard to claim 107 the Examiner states, “it is unclear how ‘a plurality of integrated circuits’ and ‘the plurality of dies sites’ are interrelated to each other?” Figs. 2 and 13 show a plurality of integrated circuit devices 48 and wafer 50. See specification page 7, lines 7-8. Thus claim 107 is definite.

In regard to claims 124-127 the Examiner states, "it is unclear how the plurality of second substrates are interconnected and associated with the electronic components and the flexible contact elements? Furthermore, it is unclear how 'a plurality of said second substrates (236) are interconnected and associated with the second substrate. It is noted that the second substrates (236) are not the same as second substrate (54)." Applicants Figs. 2 and 3 schematically show substrate 54 mounted to substrate 58 to probe a plurality of IC device 48 on wafer 50. Fig. 17 shows a plurality of substrate 236 mounted to substrate 28 and Fig. 20 shows a plurality of substrates 236 and 250 mounted to substrate 280 for making electrical connection to a plurality of electrical devices. Thus claims 124-127 are definite.

In view of the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 45-48 50, 2, 59, 95-102, 107 and 124-131 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness.

Claims 103-106, 108, 119-123 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bright et al. and as being anticipated by Zifcak. These claims have been amended to recited "at least one of said plurality of flexible contact elements includes a protuberance at the end thereof." In view thereof, these claims should be allowed for the same reason claim 29 is allowed.

In view of the changes to the claims and the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by applicants, applicants

file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner, ... the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Daniel P Morris/
Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.
Reg. No. 32,053
Phone No. (914) 945-3217

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

PATENT NO. : 5,635,846
DATED : June 3, 1997
INVENTOR(S) : Beaman et al.

Page 1 of 1

It is certified that error appears in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent is hereby corrected as shown below:

Title page.

Insert Item -- [63] **Related U.S. Application Data**, Continuation-in-part of Application No. 963,346, filed on October 19, 1992, Patent No. 5,371,654. --

Column 1.

Line 5, after the title add:

-- This application is a Continuation-in-part of Application No. 963,346, filed on October 19, 1992, Patent No. 5,371,654. --



Signed and Sealed this

Second Day of August, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jon W. Dudas".

JON W. DUDAS
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office